

REMARKS

I. **Status of the Application**

Claims 2-10 and 17-21 are pending in this application. In the November 17, 2006 office action, the examiner rejected claims 2-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. patent no. 5,066,906 to Moore (hereinafter “Moore”). In addition, the examiner allowed claims 17-21.

In this response, applicants have amended claim 2. Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration of previously rejected claims 2-10 in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

II. **Independent Claim 2**

In the November 17, 2006 office action, the examiner rejected independent claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Moore. Claim 2 has now been amended.

As provided in MPEP § 2131, “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ 2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). In addition, the elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

The Moore reference does not disclose all the limitations of amended claim 2. For example, with respect to claim 2, the Moore reference does not disclose “a rib extending across at least a portion the display receptacle, the rib configured to define a first slot between the rib and a first of the two opposing sidewalls and a second slot between the rib and a second of the two opposing sidewalls, the first slot designed and dimensioned to pass the liquid crystal display through the first slot and the second slot configured to retain the flexible conductor device in a predetermined position within the receptacle”. An embodiment of this limitation is shown in Figs. 9 and 10a, and described on pages 19-20 of the present application. As shown in the embodiment of Fig. 10A, the rib 90 defines two slots. The first slot is provided between the rib 90 and the sidewall 80. This first slot is configured to pass the liquid crystal display 74, allowing it to be inserted in the receptacle 74. This embodiment is described in the specification at page 19, line 19 to page 20, line 7. The second slot in the embodiment of Fig. 10A is provided between the rib 90 and sidewall 82. As can be seen from the figure, the flexible conducting strip 86 is retained within this second slot.

It is respectfully submitted that Moore does not disclose the above-described limitation from claim 2. In the November 17, 2006 Office action, the examiner cited element 229 of Moore in association with columns 6 and 7 of Moore as disclosing “a rib extending across at least a portion the display receptacle, the rib configured to define a slot between the rib and one of the two opposing sidewalls”. However, element 229 of Moore and the related portions of the specification do not disclose a rib defining a first slot designed to pass the liquid crystal display and a second slot configured to retain the flexible conductor device. In particular Moore does not disclose “a first slot between the

rib and a first of the two opposing sidewalls and a second slot between the rib and a second of the two opposing sidewalls, the first slot designed and dimensioned to pass the liquid crystal display through the first slot and the second slot configured to retain the flexible conductor device in a predetermined position within the receptacle.”

Moore does not include all the limitations of claim 2 for at least the reasons discussed in the preceding paragraphs. Furthermore, Moore does not disclose the “identical invention” in as “complete detail” as is contained in claim 2. *See Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ 2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Also, Moore fails to disclose the elements arranged in a fashion as required by the claim. *See In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Accordingly, Moore fails to anticipate claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), and it is respectfully submitted that the examiner’s rejection of claim 2 should be withdrawn.

V. Dependent Claims 3-10

Dependent claims 3-10 depend from and incorporate all the limitations of independent claim 2. As set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 2 is allowable. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 3-10 are also allowable for at least the same reasons that independent claim 2 is allowable, as well as other reasons. Moore does not disclose all the limitations of dependent claims 3-10, and the examiner’s rejection of dependent claims 3-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 should also be withdrawn.

VI. Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted the applicant has made a patentable contribution to the art. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is therefore respectfully requested.

In the event applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for an extension of time or payment of an additional fee, the applicant conditionally petitions therefore, and authorizes any fee deficiency to be charged to deposit account 13-0014.

Respectfully submitted,



Russell E. Fowler II
Attorney Registration No. 43,615

Please address correspondence to:

Harold C. Moore
Maginot Moore & Beck
Chase Tower
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3250
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5115

Telephone: (317) 638-2922
Facsimile: (317) 638-2139
Email: hcmoore@maginot.com